

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

REGINALD JOHNSON, et al.,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) CIVIL ACTION 12-0334-WS-M
)
RANDALL CHAMPIONS, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

ORDER

The plaintiffs have filed a “motion for an [sic] federal criminal investigation.” (Doc. 45). The plaintiffs, citing no authority, insist the Court has a “mandatory administrative dut[y] to receive any offer of information of a federal crime” and commits “a felony under related obstruction of justice statutes” if he “blocks such report.” (*Id.* at 2).

The Court has conducted an expansive search of the entirety of federal jurisprudence and has located only three instances in which a party has filed a “motion for criminal investigation.” In all three, the motion was summarily denied, without discussion. *Brennan v. Aulls*, 1987 WL 38439 at *1 (6th Cir. 1987); *Stewart v. Warden*, 2012 WL 141476 at *1 n.1 (D. Md. 2012); *Fleming v. Lackawanna County*, 2010 WL 4224626 at *1 (M.D. Pa. 2010). The Court does likewise. The motion for a federal criminal investigation is **denied**.¹

DONE and ORDERED this 24th day of January, 2013.

s/ WILLIAM H. STEELE
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ By its action, the Court does not “block” the plaintiffs’ request; the Court simply leaves the plaintiffs to the ordinary means of seeking such an investigation, i.e., by communication directly with law enforcement authorities.